

MARSHALL COUNTY REPUBLICAN.

"FREE SPEECH, FREE PRESS, FREE MEN, FREE KANSAS AND FREMONT."

VOL. 1.]

PLYMOUTH, INDIANA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1856.

[NO. 2.]

The Republican

IS PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING
BY I. MATTINGLY.

TERMS.
If paid in advance, - - - \$1.50
At the end of six months, - - - 2.00
At the end of the year, - - - 3.50
A failure to order a discontinuance at the expiration of the time subscribed for, will be considered a new engagement, and the paper continued.
If no paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Publisher.
If the above terms will be strictly adhered to.

ADVERTISING.

(TEN LINES OR LESS, BRIVERS, MAKE A SQUARE.)
One square three insertions, - - - \$1.00
Each additional insertion, - - - 25
Business Cards inserted one year, - - - 5.00
Legal advertisements must be cash in advance or accepted security. Advertisements, time not marked, will be inserted till forbidden, and charged at the above rates.

Republican Job Office.

HANDBILLS, BUSINESS CARDS, CIRCULARS, LABELS, PAMPHLETS, BLANKS, &c., &c.
Executed on the shortest notice and in the latest style.
Blank Deeds, Mortgages, Notes, Subpoenas, Executions, and all kinds of Blanks kept on hand and for sale.
Office up stairs in the old Plymouth Hotel.

DIRECTORY.

MARSHALL COUNTY DEMOCRAT, T. M. DODD and H. B. DICKSON, proprietors.

CHARLES PALMER, Dealer in Dry Goods, Boots & Shoes, Hardware, Queensware, Groceries, and Hats & Caps.

J. G. OSBORNE, Attorney & Counselor at Law. Office up stairs over Palmer's Store, Plymouth, Ind.

D. J. W. HENNETT'S office at his residence three doors north of Edwards' hotel, on Michigan street.

BROOKE & EVANS, Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Crockery and Ready made Clothing, corner Laporte & Mich. streets.

J. BROWNLEE & CO., Dealers in Dry Goods, Boots & Shoes, Ready made Clothing, Hardware & Cutlery.

D. T. A. LEMON, Practicing Physician, and dealer in Drugs & Medicines, Oils, Paints & Groceries, east side Michigan street.

A. WINDGATE, Dealer in Foreign and Domestic Groceries and Provisions, east side Michigan street.

W. L. PIATT, Chair & Cabinet maker, and Undertaker. Furniture room in north room of the old Plymouth Hotel.

J. HASELTON, Manufacturer and dealer in Boots & Shoes, and Shoe Findings, west side Michigan street.

JOSEPH POTTER Saddle and Harness manufacturer, corner Laporte and Center streets.

G. S. CLEVELAND Wholesale and retail dealer in Dry Goods, Hardware and Groceries, new building, north side Laporte st.

N. H. OGLESBEE & Co., Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Boots and Shoes, Crockery &c., in the Brick Store.

ICE CREAM SALOON, M. H. Tibbitts proprietor, up stairs in Rusk's building.

J. E. WESTERVELT & Co., Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware Boots & Shoes, Ready made Clothing &c.

PERSHING & THOMPSON, Wholesale and Retail dealer in Drugs Medicines, Oils, Paints, Glass & Glassware, and Groceries.

BROWN & BAXTER Manufacturers of Tin Sheet Iron and Copperware, and Dealers in Stoves—sign of Tin Shop & Store.

C. H. REEVE, Atty. at Law. Collections punctually attended to in Northern Indiana. Lands for sale cheap.

M. W. SMITH, Justice of the peace, will attend to business in the Circuit and Com. Pleas courts. Over the Post office.

D. R. SAWYER, HIGGINBOTHAM, Physician and Surgeon. Office at his residence on the east side of Michigan street.

JOHN COUGLE, Keeps a general assortment of Dry Goods, Groceries, Vegetables and Meats of all kinds. Cor. Gano & Mich. sts.

D. J. D. GRAY, Eclectic Physician, will attend to calls day or night. Office four doors north of C. H. Reeve's residence.

ELLIOTT & Co. Wagon, Carriage & Plow Manufacturers, at their new stand at the south end of the Bridge, Michigan street.

D. R. BROWN, Physician and Surgeon, will promptly attend to all calls in his profession. Office at his residence, south Plymouth.

L. A. JOSEPH, Cabinet Maker and Undertaker, South Plymouth.

D. R. CHAS. WEST, Eclectic Physician, Office at his residence, east side Michigan street.

L. FAIRLOR, Cabinet Maker and undertaker, corner Center & Washington streets.

EDWARDS' HOTEL, Wm. C. Edwards proprietor, corner of Michigan and Washington streets.

P. C. TURNER, Horse Carpenter & Joiner, Shop on Washington street, east of Michigan street.

A. K. BRIGGS, Horse Shoeing and Blacksmithing of all kinds done to order. Shop south east of Edwards' Hotel.

A. MICHAM HOUSE, G. P. Cherry & Son proprietors, South Plymouth.

JAMES & M. ELLIOTT Turners, Chair Makers, and Sign Painters, Michigan street, South Plymouth.

M. H. P. HER & CO., Dealers in Family Groceries, Provisions, Confectionaries &c., South Plymouth.

W. ERICK & LAMSON, House, Sign, and Ornamental Painters. Shop south end of the Bridge, Plymouth, Ind.

In the Market.
WHEAT At the highest market prices taken on subscription to the Republican, delivered at the office. Oct. 9, 56.

Knife Sharpeners, Something new at ROBERTS'.

For the Republican. REPUBLICAN SONG.

Att.—Cold Water Army.

"With banner and with badge we come,
An army true and strong;
To fight against vile slavery's hot,
"And this shall be our song."
While Freedom's glorious stripes and stars,
Above our heads float free,
We'll pledge both heart and hand to aid
FAIR KANSAS TO BE FREE.

The Key-Stone State her "mark" will set,
Like "Cain," he'll find its weight will be,
While from New-Hampshire's granite hills,
A voice to Freedom will come;
Traitor to wickedness and her cause,
For better men make room.

For Freedom's sons rise in their might,
And shout as with one voice,
Fremont and Davis, noble names!
Will be the People's choice;
Which for them we entwine;
For Equal Rights will be restored,
Also Freedom's SIX SHALL SING,
Marshall Co., Ind.

For the Republican. SECTIONALISM.

Democrats charge the Republican party with being a sectional party, and why? Because they say that the slave holding States, or the most of them, were not represented in the Republican National Convention. Well, were the whole population of the south represented in the Democratic National Convention?—Throwing the blacks aside, were the whole white population of the south represented? Did a single non-slaveholder from that quarter have a seat in the Convention? I have no idea that this was the case. Southern delegates to the Democratic National Convention, were most likely slaveholders to a man; who of course represented their own class of 350,000 persons, while they did not care a straw for the interests of the 6,000,000 of whites among them, who did not own property in human beings.

But why is it that the operations of the R-publican party are confined almost exclusively to the Free States? Because the freedom of speech, and the press is not allowed in the South. In most of the slave States, a person cannot make a Fremont speech without periling his life. There is more liberty in Turkey, or Austria, or Russia, than there is in the southern part of our confederacy. No despot can be found upon the face of the globe, so implacable, so relentless, and so crushing, as American Slavery. It seeks to surround the system with a wall of iron, and shut out every thing that can throw the least gleam of light upon it. And yet these persons who are laboring so hard to crush out every vestige of liberty, are good Democrats, and leading Democrats in the transactions of the party. Some of them have lately been portraying the beauties of slavery in the free States, while for a northern person to go south and open his mouth against slavery is instant destruction. Is this Democracy? It is southern Democracy, and the boast of northern Democrats is, that the principles of their glorious party are everywhere the same. Let the freedom of speech and of the press be enjoyed in the south, and the Republican party would soon be strongly represented in that quarter. The sympathies of tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands in the south are with us, but they are kept down by the Democratic slave oligarchy.

For the Republican. EMIGRATION.

The whole number of slaveholders in the United States are about 350,000, the whole number of slaves are about 3,500,000, and the whole number of non-slaveholders are more than 19,000,000. These facts suggest a few thoughts on emigration. Our citizens of the northern States, are averse to settling in a slave community, and this is the case with a great many non-slaveholders in the south. There are good reasons for this. In slaveholding communities, white labor is degrading. The white man who earns a support by the sweat of his brow, is thought no more of than a slave, perhaps not so much. Our hardy yeomanry will not settle in such a place, no matter how rich and inviting the country may be. They would rather live in the poorest place upon the face of the globe, where they can be on terms of equality with their neighbors. We will take Missouri for an illustration. Millions of acres in that State, of as good land as the sun ever shone upon, can be bought for government price, and less, while directly across in the State of Iowa, lands no better, are worth from five to fifteen dollars per acre. What makes the difference?—It is the detestable system of slavery.—Enterprising laborers from the north, and a great many from the south, would not take the best land in a slave State as a

gift. They will settle where labor is respected, where the laboring white man, though poor, may by merit rise in society. Who can blame them for possessing such a spirit. Well suppose slavery is established in Kansas, and other territories; the whole north will be practically excluded from these territories, and a great many non-slaveholders from the south will also be excluded. On the other hand, by prohibiting slavery in the territories, that class of persons who own property in human beings will be excluded. Which is the greatest inequality? Democrats talk as though the interests of these 350,000 slaveholders are equal to the interests of 19,000,000 of non-slaveholders. In their arguments, they invariably place us in direct opposition with the other.

For the Republican. THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

The present state of political excitement throughout the country arising from the approaching election of an incumbent for the Presidential Chair, furnishes matter for interesting and even painful reflection. To us, who are unconnected with any of the parties, and stand without the suck of the political whirlpool, the question is perfectly natural—what is there in the present realities, or the future probabilities that produces this widespread social procyonism. A cause adequate to the effect must exist somewhere; for men do not voluntarily become insane. It is easy to be seen that to certain classes the election of a President is a matter of private and selfish interest. The country is filled with office seekers; men who seem to think the ship of State is sure to be wrecked, unless they have something to do with its helm or its rigging; some of these are in office—far more of them are out; but the want to be in, and the ins want to stay in. To hear these men talk, a person might suppose that they were the purest patriots on earth, wishing to serve their country for their country's good. They have no personal interest in the matter—not they; if left to their own choice, they would prefer to retire from public life; but as matters are they are willing to sacrifice ease and fortune on the altar of their country. Of this kind are the speakers at ratification meetings, pole raisings, and other gatherings of the different parties.

Now it is not strange that there are men who have the effrontery to put forward their personal claims, backed by the plea of the public good, for the country abounds with men who do anything that will insure to their own advantage; but it is strange that steady, sober, sane people cannot only listen to such pretensions, but even catch the excitement, and enter into the cause of these pretenders with all the ardor of enthusiasm. This is strange—passing strange.

It is indeed true that in the present political campaign there are certain issues, which, skillfully managed, must exert a powerful influence over the public mind; we are willing to confess that we feel this ourselves, without giving credit for honesty to brawling politicians; but making up our judgments from well known facts, we must admit that the country has reached a crisis through which it will require no ordinary skill to guide it in safety. And it must be admitted also, that those who have the management of its affairs manifest an utter unfitness for the places they occupy. If ever a country was cursed with incompetent rulers, ours is so cursed. We can view the present administration in no other light than as a judgment that God has sent on our land for its sins. The question that is now brought before the country for its decision is: Shall slavery be restricted or extended—shall it remain where it is, or shall it spread itself into the new territories. This is the naked issue, and it is easy to see that with neither party can consistent anti-slavery men identify. It is true there is a bad and a worse. The bad however, is too bad to be touched, and that is to engage to protect slavery where it is. The question is not respecting the evil of slavery in general, it regards merely the evil of it in certain localities. The Republican party say, in effect, slavery is a very good thing where it is; but you must confine it there, we will agree to guard and defend it in its present limits, but we insist that it shall not go beyond them. While, however, we speak of the parties in this contest, we still have our preference between them, and we can have this without yielding any of our principles. We have a choice between two moral evils, if we are not to be actively engaged in producing either. If the question was presented to the country, whether Mormonism with

all its abominations should be established, or merely tolerated, we would prefer the latter while we would refuse to have any hand in either, and would testify against both; we would certainly rather see slavery restricted to its present limits than extended beyond them, but we would much rather see it rooted out where it is. This the Republican party not only do not propose to do but they bind themselves not to do it. They indeed declare themselves opposed to the extension of slavery into free territory, but they also assert that the rights of the States must and shall be preserved. Now it does not require proof that the rights of the States here means the rights secured to the States by the Constitution, and it is equally evident that to hold slaves in the States where slavery exists is one of these rights. Such a creed we cannot subscribe, and for the success of the party holding it, we dare not pray—with the so called Democratic party we have no affinity. The course pursued by the present administration with regard to Kansas, and endorsed by that party leaves it without a claim to ordinary respect, whether it continues in power or there be a change in the administration, we are willing to leave with Him who orders all things. The hearts of all men are in his hand. We earnestly desire the welfare of our country—we pray for and we seek its peace. If God be pleased to grant relief from present evils by driving from power those who have made a bad use of it we will be thankful. At the same time we have no hope of permanent good from the accession to their place of those who are still in league with sin.

But we are reminded that we are preaching politics. For this the mass of our readers will not condemn us. They are accustomed to such preaching. If they are not, we have overrated the faithfulness of our ministers; what minister worthy of the name does not preach politics, we know that there are watchmen who are described in Isaiah 56:10, 11. Alas! there are many of them, and they are the first to cry when preaching politics. There is one kind of political preaching that we do condemn—political party preaching. To make the pulpit the means of advancing the interest of either of the parties in the present contest would be to degrade, prostitute it; but to use it to point out the sins of the nation, whether constitutional or administrative, of men whether in public or private station, is to honor it and to honor Him whose message is declared from it. The same thing is true of the religious press. And we do say that we would rather our tongue and our hands were paralyzed than that we should be induced by any consideration to cease to reprove sin, whether political or private; whether of the nation, of rulers of parties, or of individuals.

A CALM LOOKER ON.
From the Laporte Union.
MR. FITCH'S SPEECH.
This city has been once more favored with the presence of the famous author of the Pomeroy letter, and if it was not for the purpose of correcting one statement which he made, we would let the worthy personage pass unnoticed. It is not a very pleasant task to defend an individual's private or public character; but it is full as pleasant to defend it as it is to attack it. Dr. Fitch, in the course of his speech the other night, attacked Col. Fremont's private and public character; and it is our intention to show our readers that Dr. Fitch knew exactly what he was doing, or that James Buchanan stands a perjured man before the American people to-day. And also, that Willis A. Gorman, a prominent Democrat of Indiana, and now Territorial Governor of Minnesota, stands perjured to the world.

The charge Dr. Fitch preferred against Col. Fremont was this: "Fremont is not deserving of any honor for his exploits in California. He never was in hearing of the guns at any attack upon the enemy; and further, he swindled the Government out of a large sum of money." Now, in order to see how much money Col. Fremont swindled the Government out of in California, we will stake the evidence of James Buchanan, under oath, against that of Doctor Fitch. It will be remembered that Col. Fremont was arrested in London on account of debts contracted in California. His defense was, that these debts were contracted on account of the United States Government. Col. Fremont drew bills of exchange to the amount of \$19,500 upon the Secretary of State of the United States—the liabilities having been incurred on Government account, while Col. Fremont was Governor of California. The bills fell into the hands of persons in London, and being protested for non-acceptance, the holders sought to hold Col. Fremont personally liable. The evidence of James Buchanan of Pennsylvania—upon whom, as Secretary of State, the bills were drawn—being considered material to the issue, the court appointed

Henry S. Gilpin, Hugh Campbell and Peter McCall, of Philadelphia, Commissioners to take depositions of witnesses for Col. Fremont in Pennsylvania. They were to be sworn and to administer oaths to interpreters, clerks, &c.—the testimony so taken to be sent under seal to the Common Pleas. James Buchanan being the only witness sworn, we give his statement in regard to these bills before this court. These bills were the same claims which Dr. Fitch tried to make us believe were illegal, and in relation to which James Buchanan, under oath said:

"To the best of my knowledge the originals of the bills, copies of which are now produced and shown to me, and are hereto annexed, marked Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4, were presented at the State Department, in the City of Washington, for acceptance and payment, but I do not recollect the individual or the individuals by whom presented. I should have accepted and paid these bills from my general knowledge of the transactions in California, had Congress appropriated any money, and placed it at my disposal, which could be applied to their payment, though it would have been more correct to have drawn these bills on the Secretary of War; I should have accepted and paid these bills, and have them charged in account against Col. Fremont, to be settled for at the general settlement of his accounts as Commander of the California battalion, had any such appropriation been made; I know of no other matter or thing touching or concerning the matters at issue in this cause, or the parties thereto material or necessary to be known and adduced on the trial thereof."

So much for James Buchanan's opinions of these claims.

Now we propose to show Dr. Fitch's misrepresentation of the honesty of Fremont, by referring our readers to the following extracts from a speech of Willis A. Gorman, of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; and as will be seen, he had this claim of Col. Fremont thoroughly investigated. It has been charged that not one dollar of this money borrowed by Col. Fremont had been used in the U. S. service. On this point Mr. Gorman said:

"There is upwards of \$866 for which there are no vouchers on file. That amount was paid to the quartermasters, but the vouchers are not yet found. The vouchers which have been presented, and copies of which I have here, are clear and satisfactory. It is satisfactory to show that the sum of \$866 for which there are no vouchers at hand, has been paid. The Committee on Military Affairs called before them an officer of the army who was with Col. Fremont, and testified to facts which ought to satisfy the House that every dollar has been accounted for."

It has been charged that with a portion of this money Fremont purchased the Mariposa tract. The charge as published in the Cincinnati Enquirer is in these words, to-wit:

"With this money he purchased the Mariposa tract, which he holds to this day as his private property. It was not until 1852 that the United States paid this borrowed money, and then not because it was a legal claim, but because Don Jose lent the money in good faith, and ought not to suffer from Fremont's fraud. The entire amount then paid, including interest, was \$4,200, which is the exact sum Col. Fremont's Mariposa tract cost the United States."

The statement of Mr. Gorman, that the disbursement of this money was satisfactorily accounted for, would be a sufficient answer to this; but we have other and more direct testimony. Mr. Gorman said: (see page 596 of vol. 26, of the Congressional Globe.)

"It was said that Col. Fremont had got this \$19,500 and bought the Mariposa land with it; and a distinguished gentleman in this House told me he had heard that he had purchased a large amount of cattle with it, upon which he had made large profits. Now the Mariposa had cost only \$5,000—though it turned out to be exceedingly valuable and worth forty or fifty times what he paid for it. But the date of that purchase was anterior to the transaction."

Another charge in reference to the meat cattle operation reads as follows:

"In the same year he bought six hundred head of cattle for \$5,000, at \$10 a head, the hides to be given back to the Mexican of whom he bought them. Not one of them was ever used for the battalion; but after it was discharged, Col. Fremont had them pastured for three years, with one Mr. Abel Stearns, the latter to be paid for the pasturage by a share of the increase. And Col. R. E. Mason says that not one of the cattle was ever used for the public purpose. The United States paid for these cattle \$6,975, including interest—not because any soldier, sailor, or marine ever tasted the beef, but because, again, it was not right that the innocent Mexican should suffer for Fremont's fraud."

On this point Mr. Gorman remarked:

"As to the alleged purchase of a large amount of cattle and the grand speculation out of the operation! How did we act as to the charge? Did we believe it blindly? No, sir, we went into an investigation of it, and what was the result? We found that he had purchased a certain amount of cattle for the use of the army, but because he had not the means of paying for them, he left the cattle in the possession of the vendor, who had finally to take them back for non-payment, so that transaction ended in smoke, as does the charge."

Mr. Gorman having thus disposed of those two charges, volunteered the following general statement:

"I will say for Col. Fremont, that when I went into the investigation of this transaction I had some prejudices which I thought perhaps might be unfounded, and which I am now satisfied were unfounded. The prejudices which had been impressed upon my mind have been dispelled by the investigation of all his conduct in California, and I am prepared to bear testimony upon this occasion to the correctness of his whole line of conduct as an officer and as a disbursing agent. Not one dollar can be traced to his hands for which he cannot give the Government satisfactory vouchers that it has been appropriately and properly applied."

Let it be borne in mind that Mr. Gorman was Chairman of the Committee of the House before whom the investigation with reference to the California claims was made. And further, that Mr. G. was a "Democrat in high standing."

Mr. McLanahan, of Pa., in some remarks on the subject, said:

"Upwards of \$200,000 of claims were presented to the Commissioners. They allowed and passed favorably on some \$31,000, the balance, about \$170,000, were not sustained by evidence, and were consequently rejected. Of the \$31,000 allowed, the claim of \$19,500—on which Col. Fremont was imprisoned in London, was unanimously allowed, and placed first on the list submitted to us by the Commissioners. This is the only demand against the Government in which Col. Fremont appears to have the slightest personal interest."

long as the California battalion existed they were under the separate and independent command of Col. Fremont, while Gen. Kearney commanded the other troops of the United States; for the rest of the year I refer to my next preceding answer. Put it into your pipes and smoke it you Old Line defenders.

The Old Lineers are as desperate now as they were in the days of 1840-41.—But all that won't save them, they are bound to go up Salt River for the next four years.

WINTHROP'S OPINION OF THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES.

Mr. Robert C. Winthrop, in his speech before the recent Whig Convention in Massachusetts—a convention which wanted nothing but a party behind it to render it imposing—paid the following tribute to the candidates who now maintain the old Whig principles respecting Slavery extension which Mr. W. has often stoutly asserted, but which now, in the hour of trial, he abandons:

"For Mr. Fremont I entertain nothing but respect and esteem. Our seats were next to each other during his brief term in the Senate of the United States, and I was a witness to his intelligent and faithful service. Our homes in Washington were within a biscuit's throw of each other for a much longer period, and I can bear the most cordial testimony to the attractions and accomplishments of more than one of those beneath his roof. His scientific attainments and explorations have reflected the highest credit on his country as well as on himself."

For the gentlemen associated with Col. Fremont, as a candidate for the Vice Presidency, I cannot restrain a still warmer expression of personal regard and friendship. I have known him as a mess-mate for four or five years in succession. We have consulted together during many of the most exciting scenes of our Congressional service, and if I ever differed from him upon any occasion, it was with an unfeigned distrust of my own judgment. We voted alike, I believe, on almost every question relating to the question of the Ten Million Texas Boundary bill. Gentlemen, I can truly say, that if any more personal attachments were to govern my course at the coming election, no name has been presented to the people which would weigh more with me than that of my friend, William L. Dayton, of New Jersey."

The editor of the Ky. Statesman, published at Lexington, was brought to this State by Mr. Breckenridge in his recent tour through the State, to record the doings of the Democracy. In a letter from that gentleman to the Statesman, the 3d of September at the Battle Ground, he says:

The speeches made by the Indiana orators, Willard, Bright, Wright, Voorhies, Buskirk, Robinson and others, are more ultra southern on the slavery question, more bitterly denunciatory of abolitionists and free soilers, more decided if possible, in their firm maintenance of the rights of the south, than we ever heard from the veriest fire-eater in the South. They hate and abuse Black Republicanism in more unmeasured terms than we do. We were amused at one of them who professed personal opposition to slavery, was unwilling to let it introduced into Indiana, but said he, "introduce it, come Dinah, come Sokey, come Swaney, come Toney—come kinkey head, thick lip, flat foot, and flat nose, rather than one little abolition Massachusetts Yankee."

THE NEXT SENATE.

The Administration of Fremont will begin under circumstances extremely hopeful for humanity and liberty. In the Senate the changes will be such as greatly to weaken the despotic power in that body, which has carried everything with so high a hand for several years past. The Evening Post gives a table of the changes that may be anticipated in that body, and comes to the conclusion that the new Senate will stand as follows:

Buchanan,	25
Fremont,	25
Fillmore,	8
	62

According to this statement the Fillmore men will hold the balance of power; and as several of them are not of the fire-eating school, we may expect that they will be as likely to vote with the Fremonters as against them.

"Keep it before the people, that to this day, no man in Kansas has ever been punished, by law, for offences committed against individuals of the Free State party—not one!"

HOUSEHOLD DEFINITIONS.

Home.—The place where children have their own way, and married men resort when they have nowhere else to keep themselves.

Wife.—The woman who is expected to purchase without means, and sew on buttons before they come on.

Baby.—The thing on account of which its mother should never go to the opera, consequently need never a new hat.

Dinner.—The meal which is expected to be in exact readiness whenever the master of the house happens home to eat it, whether at twelve or half past three.

Washing-day.—The time when a woman can draw a broom at a thiefish dog, or say, "I won't" without being thought cross.

Trouser.—The disputed territory.